DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 247 JC 950 438

TITLE	Service Expectations for Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses. Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee.
INSTITUTION	Ohio Board of Regents, Columbus.
PUB DATE	10 Sep 93
NOTE	14p.; For performance measures related to the service expectations, see JC 950 439.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; College Planning; *College Role; Community Colleges; Design Requirements; *Educational Quality; Education Work Relationship; *Institutional Mission; Multicampus Colleges; Organizational Objectives; Partnerships in Education; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; State Legislation; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio

ABSTRACT

In 1993, the Ohio General Assembly established nine service expectations for the state's two-year colleges and regional campuses to ensure a consistent level of quality regardless of organization or administrative structure. Additionally, the state Board of Regents established an Advisory Committee on Two-Year Service Expectations to identify a realistic set of indicators by which performance on the nine expectations might be evaluated. Based on reviews of performance standards nationally and consultation with education professionals, the Committee developed indicators for the nine following expectations: (1) make a range of career/technical programming available, measured by programming responsiveness to area needs, placement methods, and degree completion; (2) commitment to developmental education service, measured by responsiveness to student needs and testing methods; (3) partnerships with industry, business, government, and labor to enhance community economic development, measured by economic impact; (4) noncredit continuing education and cultural enrichment opportunities, measured by number of courses and their responsiveness to area needs/interests; (5) college transfer programs or the first 2 years of a baccalaureate degree, measured by articulation arrangements with other campuses and level of student preparation; (6) linkages with high schools to ensure adequate preparation of graduates, measured by numbers of arrangements; (7) convenient schedules measured by course offering distributions; (8) as low as possible student fees, measured by charges and costs per student; and (9) community involvement in decision-making processes, measured by processes in place to include groups. (Steps for implementing the expectations from 1993-96 are included.) (KP)

ED 386 247

REPORT OF THE REGENTS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SERVICE EXPECTATIONS FOR TWO-YEAR COLLEGES AND REGIONAL CAMPUSES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Filipic

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SEPTEMBER 10, 1993

JC 950 438

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advisory Committee for Service Expectations for Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses

Dr. Shirley Barton
Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs and
Director of Technical Programs
Kent State University

Mr. Robert Casto
Special Assistant to the President
Lima Technical College

Mr. Larry Christman
President
Association of Independent
Colleges and Universities

Dr. Barry Dorsey
President
Rio Grande Community College

Dr. Ralph Doty
President
Lakeland Community College

Mr. Joseph Gorman
Vice President-Business
Sinclair Community College

Mr. David Hartleb
Vice President and Provost
University of Cincinnati

Dr. Harriet Taylor
Director
Miami University-Hamilton

Dr. William Ivoska
Executive Director - Student Development
Owens Technical College

Dr. Jim Jordan
Professor
Ohio University-Zanesville

Dr. Robert Kollin
Vice President and Dean of Instruction
Stark Technical College

Dr. Craig Laubenthal
Dean
Ohio University-Zanesville

Dr. James Long
President
Cincinnati Technical College

Dr. Larry McDougle
President
Northwest Technical College

Ms. Polly Owen
Nursing Faculty
Columbus State Community College

Dr. Edward Ray
Senior Vice Provost
The Ohio State University

Dr. William Robinson
Board of Trustees
Southern State Community College

Dr. Greg Rose
Associate Professor
The Ohio State University-Marion

Dr. Ruth Zollinger
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Lakeland Community College

Board of Regents

Dr. Elaine Hairston
Chancellor

Dr. Howard Gauthier, Chair
Executive Associate to the Chancellor for Planning

Dr. Matthew Filipic
Vice Chancellor for Administration

Dr. Rayma Smith
Director of Academic Programming

Dr. Jane Fullerton
Assistant to the Chancellor
for Administration and Planning

Service Expectations for Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses

The Issues.

Over the last twenty years, the need for higher education has changed dramatically. No longer is higher education a luxury. It is a necessity for economic and social advancement. In its ***Economic Commentary*** (August 15, 1992) the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland noted that, "for individuals, prosperity will be more fundamentally tied to their educational achievements than ever before. Young people need to understand that most of them will require more schooling than their parents had, just to attain the same standard of living." The growing concern of the need for higher education has been shared by educators and education's partners in the business sector as the state, national and international economies shift to a global and highly advanced work environment. To be competitive, many companies are finding they need more highly educated employees who can assume greater responsibility for their work and learn new processes to increase productivity. Evidence is accumulating that higher education must play a vital role in any strategy to achieve economic success.

Even as the need for higher education has shifted, so has the nature of the college-going population. The traditional college student population is rapidly being complemented by a growing number of "new" students to higher education --adult students (many of whom are single mothers) who must balance the competing demands of school, work and home in order to build a better life for themselves--minority students and Appalachian whites who may come from a background wherein higher education was not seen as necessary, available, accessible or achievable--the recently unemployed who have suffered the impact of significant downsizing in industries that historically served as the economic backbone for Ohio--and those students who seek preparation for a workplace that is advancing technologically far beyond the boundaries for which a high school education prepared them. These new students have steadily increased the enrollments in Ohio's higher education system even as the number of young people receiving high school diplomas has reached a low period. Over the last decade, more than 70 percent of Ohio's 58,000 new students in higher education have been 25 years of age or older. Nearly three-fourths of them have been part time students. This type of enrollment growth has been particularly strong on Ohio's two-year campuses. Today these campuses are hard pressed by sharp decreases in public funding, by dramatic increases in the demand for their services, and by the challenge to maintain both student access and program quality.

Increasing Access with Scarce Resources.

The importance of two-year colleges and regional campuses in providing the benefits of higher education to local community and service areas has been recognized in Ohio for more than three decades. In the 1960's, the state government began a policy of locating a two-year campus within commuting distance of every Ohioan. The goal was reached with remarkable speed. However, there was a lack of consistency in carrying out the expansion of two-year college education. In some parts of the state the goal was met by establishing community colleges, in other parts by state community colleges, or by technical colleges, or by regional branches of state universities. The variety of two-year campuses has meant that the range of educational services available to a given community or service area depends on the particular type of campus that was established there nearly a generation ago.

The challenge of expanding student access and maintaining program quality at the state's two-year campuses during a time of diminished state support was addressed in the July 1992 report, ***Managing for the Future: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education in Ohio***. The statewide Managing for the Future Task Force, impaneled by the Ohio Board of Regents at the request of Governor Voinovich, was charged with identifying ways Ohio's higher education system could provide quality educational services more efficiently and effectively. The Managing for the Future Task Force recommended that access and quality could best be provided by a restructuring of the two-year campuses into a system of comprehensive community colleges. This change was seen as bringing Ohio in line with many other states where the community college is the primary point of access for many students, especially place-bound students, who are seeking a postsecondary education. The Board of Regents considered the recommendations of the Managing for the Future Task Force, and following a period of significant review and discussion with the educational community, issued its report, ***Securing the Future of Higher Education in Ohio***, in December 1992. This report also articulated a growing concern with efficiently and effectively expanding access to a high quality education for all Ohioans.

Service Expectations for Two-Year Campuses: System Behavior versus System Structure.

In Securing the Future, the Regents concurred with the recommendations of the Managing for the Future Task Force on the importance of increasing access to higher education while maintaining program quality. The Regents also accepted the Task Force's criticism that the current arrangement of two-year campuses failed to address this urgent need in a systematic fashion, even though each of the various two-year campuses provides important services for its local community. Rather than adopt a radical administrative restructuring of the two-year colleges and regional campuses, the Board proposed an alternative strategy to achieve the goal of increasing access and Enhancing pro-

gram quality, one which reinforced the concept of a two-year college system that is based on a service principle, not an organizational one. Accordingly, in Securing the Future the Board proposed a set of service expectations for all two-year colleges and regional campuses to meet, regardless of their individual organization or administrative structure. The Regents were concerned with what two-year campuses should do--their institutional behavior--and have an interest in administrative structures only when they fail to serve effectively. The goal of all of the various two-year campuses must be one of providing full service at an affordable price.

The General Assembly endorsed these service expectations by incorporating them in its most recent budget bill (section 3333.20 of Amended Substitute House Bill 152), which was signed by the Governor on July 1, 1993. These service expectations are designed to be responsive to the unique mission and widely ranging roles of Ohio's two-year campuses and provide a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of each campus in meeting the needs of its community/service area.

1. A range of career/technical programming preparing individuals for employment in a specific career at the technical or paraprofessional level;
2. Commitment to an effective array of developmental education services providing opportunities for academic skill enhancement;
3. Partnerships with industry, business, government, and labor for the retraining of the workforce and the economic development of the community;
4. Noncredit continuing education opportunities;
5. College transfer programs or the initial two years of a baccalaureate degree for students planning to transfer to institutions offering baccalaureate programs.
6. Linkages with high schools to ensure that graduates are adequately prepared for postsecondary programs;
7. Student access provided according to a convenient schedule and program quality provided at an affordable price;
8. Student fees charged by any institution are as low as possible, especially if the institution is being supported by a local tax levy.
9. A high level of community involvement in the decision making process in such critical areas as course delivery, range of services, fees and budgets, and administrative personnel.

Furthermore, institutional performance with regard to these service expectations was linked to the instructional subsidy through the same budget bill (ASHB 152). The Regents, in conducting its instructional subsidy consultation for the 1995-97 biennium, will identify strategies for linking a significant and growing portion of the funding distributed for two-year campuses to their performance on these nine service expectations.

Refining the Service Expectations.

The service expectations were designed to provide a broad set of guidelines for action and, as such required further refinement before being used as an effective framework for long range institutional planning and evaluation. In April, 1993, the Chancellor impaneled an Advisory Committee on Two-Year Service Expectations for Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses. It was comprised of faculty and administrative representatives from the state-assisted two-year colleges and regional campuses. The Chancellor's charge to this committee was to identify a realistic set of indicators by which performance on the nine service expectations might be evaluated. Although the Advisory Committee, in its deliberations, discussed the relationship between service expectations, performance indicators and the impact on instructional subsidy, the technical aspects of the subsidy allocation process were deferred to the next biennial subsidy consultations. The Advisory Committee completed its work in July 1993.

The Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Two-Year Service Expectations.

The Advisory Committee thoroughly and thoughtfully considered a number of strategies by which a meaningful set of indicators might be developed and implemented to evaluate performance on the service expectations. It reviewed what other states and national educational associations have proposed as performance standards and strategies for evaluation of performance. It explored at length the diversity of the two-year colleges and regional campuses and the important educational services they provide to local service areas. It sought the advice of educational professionals both within and outside of Ohio.

The primary intention of the service expectations and performance evaluation is to provide campuses with the necessary tools to be self-reflective and self-evaluative as a means of engaging in strategic planning with regard to state-level expectations for performance on each campus. The linking of instructional subsidy funds to campus-performance is designed to support this process. As such, the Advisory Committee focused its attention on designing a process and series of indicators that would be empowering and useful as a planning tool for each campus. .

Based on its efforts, the Advisory Committee first identified a set of criteria and rules to guide the selection and development of each performance indicator. These criteria and rules were intended to insure that each campus was only asked to be responsive to performance indicators that were critical to assessing whether the service expectations had been met.

Criteria for Indicators: The indicators for the nine service expectations for two-year colleges and campuses emphasize:

1. Increasing student access to higher education.
2. Improving the students' total learning experience.

3. Increasing levels of student achievement.
4. Addressing state and community/service area priorities.
5. Assuring two-year college and regional campus accountability.
6. Measuring progress and evaluating improvement.

Rules for Indicators.

All indicators are designed to:

1. Transcend the organizational structure of individual two-year colleges and regional campuses;
2. Be linked to the missions of two-year colleges and regional campuses;
3. Be simple, clear and provide meaningful information for evaluating performance;
4. Be documented with interpreted data.

Reporting on Indicators for Service Expectations.

In preparing reports on their performance on each of the service expectations, the Advisory Committee on Two-Year Service Expectations recommends that the state-assisted two-year colleges and regional campuses consider the following:

1. Reports on the nine service expectations, as exemplified by their indicators, should be presented in narrative form.
2. Each service expectation should be discussed in terms of:
   (i) current programs and activities;
   (ii) processes and procedures for evaluating quality and responsiveness to state and regional priorities;
   (iii) evaluation of the impact and outcomes of programs and activities.
3. The narrative for each service expectation should be analytical in nature (not simply a restatement of data or description) and should answer the following questions.
   a. How are you currently meeting this expectation?
   b. What process do you use to evaluate the impact or outcomes of your efforts to meet this service expectation?
   c. How do you rate your overall performance in meeting this service expectation?
   d. On the basis of your evaluation of performance what needs or gaps have you identified?
   e. What are your plans for meeting these needs or gaps?
   f. If you are not now meeting this service expectation, how is it being met in your community/service area?

4. Responses for each service expectation should be informative but brief. While two-year colleges and regional campuses may use material from available planning and accreditation reports, responses should complement, not duplicate, functional mission and accreditation reports. The total report should be approximately 30-50 pages with an executive summary. Appendices may be included as needed.

5. The report should focus on analysis and future goal setting with regard to the performance indicators. Responses should not be burdened with excessive data reporting. Only data that illustrate institutional performance and outcomes are necessary.

Indicators for the Service Expectations.

The Advisory Committee recommends that each two-year college and regional campus be evaluated in terms of the indicators that are specified for each of the nine service expectations. For each service expectation there is a set of indicators, followed by a series of questions for each of the indicators. The questions are only to be considered stimulative. They suggest what information or data might be provided as supporting evidence of performance relative to each indicator. As such they are designed to complement, not substitute for, the six questions that the colleges or regional campuses are requested to answer for each service expectation (item 3a-f of preceding section).

Expectation No. 1.

A range of career/technical programming preparing individuals for employment in a specific career at the technical or paraprofessional level.

Indicators

A. Technical degree and certificate programs offered in response to community/service area priorities.

   1. How has the range of technical degree and certificate programs changed over the past reporting period?

   2. What has been the trend in enrollment over the past reporting period?

   3. What process are you using to determine if technical degree and certificate programs are meeting community/service area priorities?

B. Placement.

   1. What is the trend in job placements for degree and certificate programs?

   2. What process or procedures are in place to evaluate and improve your job placement rate?

C. Degree completion.

   1. What is the trend in completion rates for students in your degree programs?

   2. What is the trend in completion rates for students in your certificate programs?

3. What process or procedures are you using to evaluate and improve retention and completion rates?

Expectation No. 2.

Commitment to an effective array of developmental education services providing opportunities for academic skill enhancement.

Indicators

A. Developmental courses, at a minimum in reading, language skills, and mathematics, that meet students' academic needs.

1. What developmental courses in reading, language skills, and mathematics are offered?
2. How do you measure and demonstrate the effectiveness of developmental courses on student performance in subsequent coursework?

B. Testing to determine the need for and appropriate placement in developmental courses.

1. What placement testing is done?
2. How is the effectiveness of placement testing evaluated?

C. Developmental services, at a minimum in tutoring and study skills, that meet students' academic needs.

1. What tutoring and study skill services are offered?
2. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of these developmental services?

Expectation No. 3.

Partnerships with industry, business, government, and labor for the education and training of the workforce to enhance the economic development of the community.

Indicator

A. Workforce educational and training initiatives developed in cooperation with industry, business, government and labor.

1. What workforce educational and training initiatives currently exist with industry, business, government and labor?
2. How is the economic development impact of these workforce initiatives evaluated?

Expectation No. 4.

Noncredit continuing education and cultural enrichment opportunities.

Indicators

A. Noncredit professional development and personal enrichment courses offered to satisfy community/service area needs and interests.

1. What is the number, type and frequency of courses offered?
2. What is the extent of community/service area participation in the planning of noncredit CED course offerings?
3. How do you evaluate the quality and effectiveness of professional development and personal enrichment courses?

B. Programs for cultural enrichment offered to satisfy community/service area needs and interests.

1. What is the number, type and frequency of cultural enrichment programs offered?
2. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of cultural enrichment programs in meeting community/service area needs?

Expectation No. 5.

College transfer programs or the first two years of a baccalaureate degree for students planning to transfer to four year institutions.

Indicators

A. Associate of Arts, Science, and Individualized Study degree programs reflecting community/service area priorities.

1. How do you assess whether your associate degree programs are responsive to community/service area priorities?

B. Programs and courses leading to bachelor's degrees reflecting community/service area priorities.

1. How do you assess the responsiveness of your programs leading to a bachelor's degree to community/service area priorities?

C. Arrangements among campuses which facilitate completion of bachelor's degrees through transfer or relocation.

1. What process is in place to facilitate the transfer or relocation of students to bachelor degree programs?

D. Appropriate preparation of students for transfer or relocation.

1. By what process do you assess the preparation of your students for transfer or relocation?
2. How do you assess your transfer and relocation process in terms of student outcomes?

Expectation No. 6.

Linkages with high schools to ensure that graduates are adequately prepared for higher education. These linkages should include a student oriented focus and marketing strategies to ensure that high school students are aware of their educational opportunities within the community/service area.

Indicators

A. Formal and/or informal linkages between high schools, two-year colleges and regional campuses to improve academic readiness to do college level work.

1. What formal and/or informal programs or arrangements exist with local high schools to improve academic readiness?
2. How do you assess the impact and outcomes of those arrangements?
3. What feedback do you provide to the local high schools on the effectiveness of those arrangements?

B. Programs on the importance of higher education, the educational opportunities available at two-year colleges and regional campuses and the means of achieving admission and acquiring financial aid.

1. What programs/workshops/seminars are offered to potential students, parents and community groups?
2. How do you measure and assess the outcomes of the programs you offer on educational opportunities and the means of achieving admission and acquiring financial aid?

Expectation No. 7.

Student access provided according to a convenient schedule and program quality provided at an affordable price.

Indicators

A. Process for program evaluation and quality improvement.

1. How do you evaluate the quality of your associate degree and certificate programs?
2. How do you evaluate the quality of your programs leading to a bachelor's degree?
3. What process is followed or what type of actions are taken when program quality is found to be in need of improvement?.

B. Courses offered at times reflecting community/service area priorities.

1. What is the distribution of course offerings over the hours and days of a week for Autumn quarter/semester?
2. What is the process by which you judge the appropriateness of the days and times at which courses are offered?

C. Access through reasonable fees and financial aid.

1. What are the average student cost/credit hour and cost/FTE, including all fees, per semester/quarter?
2. What is the average annual amount of financial aid per student FTE?
3. What percentage of your students are receiving financial aid?

Expectation No. 8.

Student fees charged by a two-year college or regional campus are as low as possible, especially if the institution is supported by a local tax levy.

Indicator

A. Fees in context of institutional mission, costs, local tax support, and state support.

1. What are the total charges per full-time student, including tuition, general fees and special fees for a 15 quarter hour or equivalent load?
2. What is the annual local tax, if any, collected per student FTE?
3. What is your total cost per FTE (total expenditures, not including grants, capital improv ments, or private contributions divided by total FTEs) for the budget year most recently completed.
4. What percentage of your total costs per FTE are covered by state subsidy for the budget year most recently completed.

Expectation No. 9.

Community involvement in the decision making process in such critical areas as course delivery, range of services, fees and budgets, and administrative personnel.

Indicators

A. A decision-making process in place that is responsive to community/service area concerns.

1. What groups (minorities, business, professional, etc.) are represented on your governing and advisory boards?
2. What activities and actions are undertaken by your governing and advisory boards to assess community needs?
3. What is the process by which governing or advisory boards assess your responsiveness to community/service area priorities?

B. Processes in place to improve continuously community/service area involvement in the life of the two-year colleges and regional campuses.

1. What process is in place to assess and improve community/service area involvement in the life of your institution?
2. In what ways has community involvement, other than the use of advisory or governing boards, been utilized to effect decisions on campus in such areas as course delivery, range of services, fees and budgets, and administrative personnel?

Implementation of Service Expectations.

To effectively implement the nine service expectations for two-year colleges and regional campuses, the following steps should be taken.

1. During the academic year 1993-94, the two-year colleges and regional campuses will engage in self-studies to evaluate their current performance relative to each of the nine service expectations.
2. The self-study reports will be submitted to the Board of Regents no later than June 30, 1994.
3. In accordance with Amended Substitute House Bill 152, for purposes of applying the service standards at co-located campuses, the Board of Regents will regard the university branch campus and the technical college as a whole entity.
4. Beginning in January 1994, the biennial subsidy consultations will develop the technical requirements for coupling the nine service expectations, with their indicators, to the allocation of a percentage of the instructional subsidy for two-year colleges and regional campuses.
5. The percentage of the instructional subsidy for FY 1996 to be based on the performance of the two-year colleges and regional campuses will be set by the Board of Regents by January 1, 1994.
6. By July 1, 1994, the Board of Regents will begin consultations with the two-year colleges and regional campuses on their experiences in applying the service expectations, with their indicators, to their self-review of performance. The purpose of the consultation will be to determine if there are alterations or additions to the indicators which would improve the evaluation of performance on the service expectations.
7. Beginning with the academic year 1994-95, the two-year colleges and regional campuses will be evaluated with respect to their performance on the nine service expectations. These evaluations will be the basis on which a percentage of the instructional subsidy will be distributed in FY 1996.
8. Subsequent evaluations of the performance of two-year colleges and regional campuses on the nine service standards will be undertaken every five years, except for those colleges and campuses experiencing difficulties in meeting the service standards. Two-year colleges and regional campuses that are unable to satisfactory meet the service standards will be evaluated on a two year cycle that corresponds with the second year of the biennial budget. This two year schedule of review shall continue until an institution is able to demonstrate acceptable performance on all of the service standards.